

Message

From: Donohue, Joyce [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BB5340EC745149EDBF80D2B8B2F9B919-JDONOHUE]
Sent: 9/18/2017 8:13:09 PM
To: Joesph Cotruvo [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
Subject: PFC articles
Attachments: Wang, Dewitt-PFAS substances - 2017.pdf; Barzen Hanson et al.-firefighting foams-2017.pdf

I like Wang. Barzen-Hanson is also interesting

-----Original Message-----
From: Joesph Cotruvo [mailto: [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 3:59 PM
To: Donohue, Joyce <Donohue.Joyce@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: JAWWA paper

Thanks Joyce. It helps.

On 9/18/2017 3:01 PM, Donohue, Joyce wrote:

> I just checked it and you are correct. I get the two brominated ones mixed up. The value happens to be the same as IRIS. The cancer number was not selected because it is a Suggestive carcinogen meaning that it is like the old C carcinogens that would use the risk management factor. She used the 10 fold risk management and an RfD of 80%.

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Joesph Cotruvo [mailto: [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
> Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 2:38 PM
> To: Donohue, Joyce <Donohue.Joyce@epa.gov>
> Subject: Re: JAWWA paper

>
> Joyce,

>
> As I understand it the MCLG for DBCM was set at 60 ppb in the 1998 DBP rule, and it did not change in the Stage 2 rule. I think it confuses people when EPA sets an MCLG based upon non cancer effects (albeit from corn oil study) but then also computes cancer risk values. There is a table in the 2005 report that you sent and in the Stage 2 rule but I could not find an explanation why the cancer risk was not selected for DBCM. Maybe it is in the proposal? Maybe I skimmed past it. The IRIS documents do not explain that the Cancer risk calculation was superceded by the non cancer or limited information situation. i.e. that the genotox data base was not sufficient.

>
> Joe

>
> On 9/18/2017 11:17 AM, Donohue, Joyce wrote:
>> Dear Joe:

>> This is the link to the most recent BTHM document. It is publicly available.

>> <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/P1006GVD.PDF?Dockey=P1006GVD.PDF>

>> Joyce

>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Joesph Cotruvo [mailto: [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
>> Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 9:19 AM
>> To: Donohue, Joyce <Donohue.Joyce@epa.gov>
>> Subject: Re: JAWWA paper

>> OK

>> On 9/18/2017 9:17 AM, Donohue, Joyce wrote:
>>> I am on a conference call so it will have to be later.

>>> -----Original Message-----
>>> From: Joesph Cotruvo [mailto: [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
>>> Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 9:09 AM
>>> To: Donohue, Joyce <Donohue.Joyce@epa.gov>

>>> Subject: Re: JAWWA paper
>>>
>>> Joyce,
>>>
>>>
>>> Sounds good. Can you call today? Detlef is getting some mixed signals.
>>>
>>> Joe
>>>
>>>
>>> On 9/18/2017 8:53 AM, Donohue, Joyce wrote:
>>>> Dear Joe:
>>>>
>>>> I am in the office today. I have almost completed the draft. The reference list is being compiled
at present. The person who did the assessments with me at Oak Ridge is working with me on it and she
has it now. I gave her a few things to do beside the reference list but not many.
>>>>
>>>> The review cannot begin until I have the completed draft. That will be the challenging part.
>>>>
>>>> Joyce
>>>>
>>>> -----Original Message-----
>>>> From: Joesph Cotruvo [mailto:] **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**
>>>> Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 1:29 PM
>>>> To: Donohue, Joyce <Donohue.Joyce@epa.gov>
>>>> Subject: JAWWA paper
>>>>
>>>> Hi Joyce,
>>>>
>>>> How is it going with the JAWWA PF paper? Can we talk on Monday?
>>>>
>>>> Joe
>>>>
> --
> Joseph Cotruvo

--
Joseph Cotruvo